

REMARKS

Applicant has reviewed the Office Action mailed on December 6, 2007 as well as the art cited. Claims 1-39 are pending in this application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 17, 19-21, 23-25, 27, 30, 31, 33, 35, 36, and 38 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tidwell, (European Patent Application No. EP0981088). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites:

A method comprising:

- a. receiving a message formatted according to Abstract Syntax Notation One (ASN.1);
- and
- b. decoding the received message based on a previously stored configuration information file (CIF), wherein the CIF is a table-driven data file.

Applicants assert that nothing in Tidwell teaches or suggests all the limitations of claim 1. In particular, nothing in Tidwell teaches or suggests “decoding the received message based on a previously stored *configuration information file (CIF), wherein the CIF is a table-driven data file.*” With respect to configuration information files, the present specification states

The CIF defines actions for allowing creation of new messages without having to update the operational software. The CIF defines uplink message definition based on the ASN.1 schema. The CIF is *tree-based and table driven* to define message syntax.

Pg. 6 lines 15-18. This is in contrast to conventional techniques which feeds messages through an ASN.1 compiler to obtain compilable or linkable entities (e.g., *C source file structures* and modules, object files, etc.). The entities are compiled and linked with the other operational software components to obtain resultant software executable, which includes the ability to decode and encode messages that were defined in the original ASN.1 message schema.

Pg. 2 lines 16-20.

Similar to the conventional techniques discussed above, Tidwell discusses

The ADEP 310 can be produced by an ASN.1 compiler which converts an ASN.1 specification, such as that in Table 2, into encoding and decoding *routines* in the programming language of the application program 305. Where a high-level programming language (for example, C, C++, FORTRAN) is used to write the application program, the output of the compiler is *source code* which is again compiled with the application program 305.

Pg. 7 paragraph [0035]. However, nothing in Tidwell teaches or suggests “a previously stored configuration information file (CIF), wherein the CIF is a *table-driven data file*.” Claim 1, therefore, is not anticipated by Tidwell and Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Independent claims 10, 19, 30 and 35 each contain limitations similar to the limitation discussed above with respect to claim 1. In particular, claims 10 and 19 contain the limitation “a configuration information file (CIF), wherein the CIF is a table-driven data file.” Claims 30 and 35 contain the limitation “a previously stored configuration information file (CIF), the CIF being a table-driven data file.” Accordingly, the arguments discussed above with respect to claim 1 are applicable to claims 10, 19, 30, and 35 and not repeated for the sake of brevity. For at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, claims 10, 19, 30, and 35 are not anticipated by Tidwell. Applicants, therefore, request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 2-6, and 8 depend from claim 1 and, thus, are allowable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1. Similarly, claims 11-15, 17, 20-25, 27, 31, 33, 36, and 38 depend from claims 10, 19, 30, and 35 respectively and, thus, are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above concerning the respective independent claims. Applicants, therefore, request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9, 18, 28, 34 and 39 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tidwell in view of applicant’s admitted prior art. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 9, 18, 28, 34, and 39 depend from claims 1, 10, 19, 30, and 35, respectively, and inherit the limitations of the respective independent claim. As stated above, nothing in Tidwell teaches or suggests “a configuration information file (CIF), wherein the CIF is a table-driven data file.” The applicants’ admitted prior art does not cure this defect in Tidwell. Therefore, for

at least the reasons stated above, claims 9, 18, 28, 34 and 39 are not obvious over Tidwell in view of applicants' admitted prior art. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 29 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tidwell in view of Allison (U.S. Patent No. 5,917,900). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 29 depends from claim 19 and, thus, inherits the limitations of claim 19. As discussed above, nothing in Tidwell teaches or suggests “, wherein the CIF is a table-driven data file.” Nothing in Allison cures this defect in Tidwell. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above, claim 29 is not obvious over Tidwell in view of Allison. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 7, 16, 26, 32 and 37 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tidwell. Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion.

Claims 7, 16, 26, 32 and 37 depend from claims 1, 10, 19, 30, and 35, respectively, and inherit the limitations of the respective independent claim. As stated above, nothing in Tidwell teaches or suggests “a configuration information file (CIF), wherein the CIF is a table-driven data file.” Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above, claims 9, 18, 28, 34 and 39 are not obvious over Tidwell. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that claims **1-39** are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 332-4720.

Respectfully submitted,

/David N. Fogg/

David N. Fogg

Reg. No. 35138

Date: March 6, 2008

Attorneys for Applicant
Fogg & Powers LLC
P.O. Box 581339
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1339
T – (612) 332-4720
F – (612) 332-4731